

Group Memory
Transportation Coop Committee
January 26, 2017

March 9, 2017, May 25, 2017, July 27, 2017, September 28, 2017, November 2, 2017	All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room, Sacramento Airport (unless otherwise noted)
--	--

-Desired outcome for March 9 meeting:

- Spring Conference Update
- Legislative update
- Funding mechanism for UCD Pavement Research Institute (Mike P)
- ~~Close off the A&E Group, define new project: How to help struggling agencies deliver federal aid projects.~~
- NEPA and CEQA documents – Federal funding of CEQA document preparation
- Maybe Lean 6-sigma updates
- How can the TCC help with the lean 6 sigma projects?

Agenda Committee

May meeting

Bridge pilot projects update?

Ray

Adriann

Mike P

Robert N

Jean

Bin List & Great Ideas

Report - Ohio experiment on Safe Harbor Indirect Cost Rate (after June 2014) (Ray Z, 12/5/2013)

Some sort of a press release to our different channels on what we are working on, etc. (Colleen, 1/29/2015)

How can we help you with the lean 6 sigma efforts? We want this to be successful. (Tom; 1-26-2017)

Charter / PURPOSE - California Transportation Coop Committee serves to:

- Address transportation funding, procedural and legislative issues related to project delivery from a local perspective. (modified January 2015).
- Enhance the working relationship between cities & counties, COGs and RTPAs, Caltrans, CTC and FHWA. This extends to improving communication with all stakeholders. Collaboration is a key method. (modified January 2015)

- Spread information and improve access to all stakeholders through the use of technology.(modified January 2015)
- Partner with Caltrans and FHWA to improve efficiency and enhance the ability to meet all stakeholder needs. (modified January 2015)

Ground Rules:

Start on time. End on time or early.

Identify if you have to leave early and have an agenda item.

Consensus decisions. You must be able to live with it.

Keep side conversations silent.

Send alternate if you are not able to attend.

Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with a ~~strike through~~, but left on the list for one meeting. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

September 19, 2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
32	Ray Z Mark	get the statutes or the foundation of the Caltrans legal opinion relating to software and data sharing 11/7/2013 1/8/2014 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014 9/11/2014 11/13/2014 Jan 29, 2015 3/5/2015 5/7/2015 9/24/2015 1/28/2016 3/3/2016 9/22/16 11/03/2016	1/26/2017 3/9/2017

December 5, 2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
34	John Winton	Send office bulletin/memo on lump sum/pro rata to the group via Lori. (see discussion notes #1) Today 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014 11/13/2014 Jan 29, 2015 5/7/2015 Winton will continue to do this and work up some sort of a Q&A (see discussion notes under agenda item # 2 from November meeting)	1/1/2016 1/28/2016 3/3/2016 5/26/2016 9/22/16 11/3/2016 1/26/2017 3/9/2017

From July 21, 2016 meeting

130	Scott	Send CAP Review list and questions to Lori for distribution to the Committee	9/22/16 9/29/2016 1/26/2017
-----	-------	--	---

131			
-----	--	--	--

From September 22, 2016 meeting

131	Ray	Follow up with Ct Budgets on HSIP funding swap (See agenda item # 3)	11/3/2016 1/26/2017
-----	-----	--	-----------------------------------

From January 26, 2017 meeting

133	Scott	FHWA will share information on sanctuary cities via e mail as it becomes available. (See agenda item # 5)	On-going
134	Winton	Work on developing more sample forms to assist local agencies in getting through the federal aid process.	11/2/2017
135	All for Rick	Review the "do-ables list" and send comments or elaborations to Rick. (mark to send out)	2/10/2017

Critique from last meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Good attendance and good discussions	Start on time –
Good use of time	Fan noise in the room is bad.

Critique from this meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Lunch	Focus on projector. Fonts on PPT slides
Good attendance	Meeting Agenda and presentation materials on the TCC web page.
Good discussion	
Transition plan for life after Ray.	

1	9:00	Introductions	All	
---	------	---------------	-----	--

Agenda Item 1.

2	9:05	Ground Rules; Action Items; Review Agenda	Mike Halverson	Understand meeting process and status of action items
---	------	---	----------------	---

Agenda Item 2. Caltrans Updates

2. 1. **Traffic Ops and Env. Analysis divisions have acting division chiefs: Amarjeet Benipal for Traffic Ops and Phil Stolarski for Env. Analysis.**

2. 2. Mark Samuelson will be acting Div Chief for Local Assistance; then John Hule.
2. 3. District 1 will be getting new District Director soon.

3	9:20	RTPA Update	Adriann Cardoso	Information Sharing
---	------	-------------	-----------------	---------------------

Agenda Item 3. RTPA

3. 1. We met on Dec. 7th – STIP workshop was Jan 19th.
3. 2. Local Assistance will be reporting accomplishments from oversight activities.
3. 3. Funding now available for TCRP projects – we will be checking to verify funding remaining.
3. 4. 2018 STIP – We will be briefing our group's new members on the programming process.
3. 5. There will be a workshop in mid-February on STIP fund estimate assumptions-
3. 6. There will be a second workshop on OA.

4	9:30	CTC Allocation Update	Mitch Weiss	Information Sharing
---	------	-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Agenda Item 4. CTC Allocation update

4. 1. There will be a workshop on Permanent guidelines and the specific guidelines for the cycle.
4. 2. Permanent guidelines – we would like suggestions on these; one thing we are looking for performance measures that will add value, and will help us manage better.
4. 3. We have capacity to advance projects – two types: transit/rail/public transportation; SHS projects programmed in the 16/17 year and were pushed out due to the funding crisis.
4. 4. We are looking for ATP projects.
4. 5. RTP guidelines with separate sections for MPO's and RTPA's have been developed.
4. 6. We are working on guidelines on freight and goods movement projects.
4. 7. TCRP – there is some funding available for these projects. (all information is on the website.)

5	9:40	FHWA Update	Scott McHenry	Information Sharing
---	------	-------------	---------------	---------------------

Agenda Item 5. FHWA Update

5. 1. Transition team is working closely with our headquarters office on new administrators. California Division will have changes as well.
5. 2. Lamin Williams will be covering the Northern Cal project team –
5. 3. LEAP program we will be working directly with local agencies – Orange, San Jose and San Diego counties have a chance to be one of the five nationally identified counties for this. Next steps will be establishing criteria to reduce the 14 local agencies nationwide down to five, and then make the final selection for the five nationally selected local agencies.
5. 4. Emergency Relief – we are looking at data to see if any betterments could reduce the ER load in the future. The OIG has been looking at the possibility that betterments could improve resiliency. There are no changes in policy at this time. ER project approval delegation to the state has been rescinded. All ER approvals will now come from FHWA.
5. 5. A & E contracting guidance document is under review. There may be a statewide review on A&E contracting.
5. 6. OIG will be looking at force account work.
5. 7. FHWA will share information on sanctuary cities via e mail as it becomes available. (see upshot # 133)

6	9:50	NEPA Assignment	Tammy Massengale	Information Sharing
---	------	-----------------	------------------	---------------------

Agenda Item 6. NEPA Assignment

6. 1. The legislature is concerned about taking this on right now – the legislation will go through the normal process. First hearing on it will be next Monday.
6. 2. After March 31, if there is no action by the legislature, Caltrans will have to go back through the entire application process, including auditing that we did before. Caltrans is not staffed up to do this work so there will be delays in approvals if the legislature does not act.

7	10:05	Sustainable Freight Corridor & CUCR Designation Process	Jose Marquez-Chavez	
---	-------	---	---------------------	--

Agenda Item 7. Sustainable Freight Corridor & CUCR Designation Process

7. 1. The technical working group included MPOs' RTPA's, Seaport representatives, FHWA, CTC, Native American Tribal representatives and self-help county representatives.
7. 2. There were close to three hundred potential projects.
7. 3. The National Highway freight network consists of primary highway freight system, other interstates, critical urban and critical rural freight corridors.
7. 4.

8	10:35	Caltrans Asset Management Updates	Michael Johnson	
---	-------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	--

Agenda Item 8. Asset Management

8. 1. MAP-21 and the FAST Act have required an asset management plan for every state.
8. 2. National performance measures must be used.
8. 3. The Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) includes the National Highway System.
8. 4. California Government Code requires a robust asset management plan that guides the investment in highways and bridges.
8. 5. The TAMP includes performance gap analysis, life cycle cost analysis, risk management and investment strategies. It must be submitted by April 21.
8. 6. Information is available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/assetmgmt/>
8. 7. Mike Johnson will make his presentation available as a .pdf file.

9	11:05	Streamlining Local Assistance Processes – Lean Six Sigma of Invoice Review and E76	Dee Lam and David Giongco	
---	-------	--	---------------------------	--

Agenda Item 9. Streamlining invoice review

9. 1. Goal is to reduce the defects to– 22 defects per 100 invoices.
9. 2. The improvement plan includes tools, training, and communication.
9. 3. This study was piloted in District 03.
9. 4. Improvement and streamlining are both focused on making your job easier.
9. 5. E76 streamlining – The problem is that the process takes too long. This project was focused on data from District 10.
9. 6. E76 processing time averaged 42 days within Caltrans. The Goal is to get this down to 14 days or less for 95% of the submittals.
9. 7. Analysis of the E76 process shows the authorization request and the FADS submittals are often incomplete.
9. 8. We are working to streamlining and revising the E76 process to make it mistake proof, by simplifying the forms and standardizing the procedures.

	12:00	LUNCH		
--	-------	-------	--	--

10	1:00	State of Caltrans Update	Malcolm / Kome / Coco (Invited)	Information Sharing
----	------	--------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------

Agenda Item 10. Caltrans Update

10. 1. **LA Procedure manual has been updated. The manual right now is up to date.**
10. 2. **We are looking into updating the LA manual on an annual basis, more systematically than in the past.**
10. 3. **Next version update will be in 2018.**
10. 4. **We have five positions (filled already) to fill for A&E procurement effort. We are developing an A&E procurement manual. Agencies will be able to adopt that manual as their own, should they choose. We are hoping to have the manual out by the end of February.**
10. 5. **We will be doing outreach to agencies on the A&E procedures.**
10. 6. **HBP Advisory Committee is looking at possible changes to how the program is managed.**
10. 7. **Federal Lands Access grants – deadlines will be moving out due to weather-related emergencies. There will be two webinars. Feb 9, noon to 2pm; Feb 16th noon to 2pm.**

11	1:30	Opening comments and purpose of the afternoon annual planning session – Review the agenda	All	What are our goals? What have we accomplished? Identify key TCC accomplishments from the last two (+/-) years.
----	------	---	-----	--

Agenda Item 11. Question from Ray

What have we done over the last year?

- We have improved the processes.
- We have opened communication.

12	1:40	2015 Priority Work Groups	Group leaders	
----	------	---------------------------	---------------	--

2015-2017 Priority Work Group Reports

Agenda Item 12.

12. 1. **Where can we best put federal dollars? John H (Lead)– Ross, Shawn, Adriann**

12. 1. 1. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Having trouble getting information from others. We are looking for ways to minimize the number of projects with federal dollar participation. Is there a way to pool federal funds for exchange? Any way to provide an incentive? Pat will set up a conference call for the group members

12. 1. 2. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We had a conference call meeting in June. We will get together again. This is really a regional issue. It is very hard to get the local agencies engaged. There is an RTPA report out on this already.

12. 1. 3. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We have not had time to follow up with regional contacts on implementation. There is nothing we can do at a statewide level. Regions have to take the lead on this. We cannot trade federal funds on a statewide basis, from one region to another. Federal guidelines restrict the application of federal funds. The federal funds are set for specific things, and for specific projects only, and we cannot make those federal funds more

general, available statewide, with less restrictions, in their application. We will get the regions more involved, to wrap this up.

12. 1. 4. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) Progress has lagged. Pat will reach out to the regional partners on this. Regions are so different that things that would work in one region would not necessarily work for others. Pat hopes to summarize the information and send it out prior to the January meeting.

Transportation Co-op Committee

2015 Priority Goal No. 1

Where can we best put our federal dollars?

WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS?

This is something that this Committee has talked about off-and-on for many, many years. Each of us will answer the question differently.

According to the notes from the January 2015 Planning meeting, the following are the thoughts/ideas:

- Develop a pilot program to broker these funds i.e. those that have the capability to purchase federal funds from others (probably at some discount) who wanted to save the time and expense of using federal funds.
 - ✓ Not quite sure how we would get started on such a pilot program. We would need some “seed” federal dollars.
 - ✓ Probably some restrictions on the use of the federal funds that would be bought by one Region from another Region.
- Focus federal money to make most efficient use – as I always heard it stated, concentrate the federal funding on the fewest projects possible.
 - ✓ It seems that a lot of programs wanting to spread the money around, give out less than the maximum amount of federal funds to each project and there doesn’t seem to be a way to consolidate the local funds to maximize the use of federal funds.
 - ✓ How can we require that the local match funds on Statewide programs are to be provided to the State for consolidation purposes in exchange for more federal funds or Toll Credits?

CONCLUSION

- 1) There is no simple, global, magic solution to a complex problem. The problem is complex due to the specific/special funding allocations in the State. Pointing to the State (Caltrans) and telling them that the answer is very simple – just exchange all of the federal funds for clean State funding before allocation ignores the fact that State gas tax revenues have declined and will continue to decline with the low price of oil/gasoline.
- 2) It might be possible to include this exchange as part of a State-wide increase in transportation funding, if the increase was of sufficient size.
 - a) Not all of Caltrans work (such as routine maintenance work) is eligible for federal funding.
- 3) Developing a Statewide plan for reducing the federal footprint of transportation projects can be achieved on Programs managed at the State level, such as the Local Highway Bridge Program and the Local Safety Program. A Statewide Plan cannot be developed for Programs managed by the Regions because each Region operates differently and there is not a desire to give up local control.
 - a) For Statewide Programs, Caltrans is concerned about dictating changes without a strong consensus from the Regions and local agencies. Thus, Caltrans will develop tools for the toolbox such as the Bridge Investment Credit Program but will not mandate its use. Caltrans will defer to others to make the mandates.
 - i) For changes to be mandated on Statewide Programs, the Regions and local agencies will have to demand the mandates.
 - b) For those Programs managed by the Regions, the changes must be initiated by the Regions and will not necessarily be uniform or even implemented by each Region because of the differing needs of each Region.
- 4) There is a desire to do something to lessen the footprint of federally-funded transportation projects, but the conclusion is that it will be up to the Statewide Program Managers/Committees and the Regions to determine what is best for their Program or Region.

IDEAS

- 1) Set a minimum \$ threshold to federally fund projects. At the State, Caltrans does this with the SHOPP Program. They federalize only those SHOPP projects over \$1mil (Construction Cap), or any Safety project over \$300k. Projects with CON CAP costs less than these minimums are funded with State-Only funds.
- 2) Maximize federal reimbursement percentages. As mentioned, any time project sponsors have more skin-in-the-game than the standard 88.53/11.47 ratio (which is typically viewed as a good thing), it has the unintended consequence of INCREASING the federal footprint by spreading the federal dollars over more projects, rather than fewer. Ultimately to reduce the federal footprint we'll have to push for more large \$\$\$ projects, fewer small \$\$\$ projects, and higher/maximized reimbursement rates.
- 3) For a certain threshold of project, say under \$2mil CON contract, we could federalize ONLY the CON/CE phase. Agencies would fund the PE and/or RW phases with "other" funds then, through either Tapered/Flexible Match or Toll Credits, would get their CON/CE Authorization at 100% fed reimbursement. We probably can't impose this on larger projects where we would be asking agencies to float large PE and/or RW efforts, but perhaps smaller efforts could be handled this way. A side benefit is that agencies would not have to follow federal contract law for the PE/RW phases.....just state contract law. Considering all the issues project sponsors are having with A&E Consultant Contracts, pulling some of these efforts out of the federal requirements seems like a worthwhile endeavor to at least investigate. This also keeps us out of PE>10 issues, or having to pull funds back from projects that go through multiple design/scope/concept iterations.
- 4) Establish a model similar to the Bridge Investment Credit Program (refer to this link http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA_OB/2015/ob15-04.pdf) for other funding programs. It is a similar idea to the tapered match – perform certain work using local funds earning credit for the match on larger projects thereby consolidating the federal funds to few projects.
- 5) Promote the exchange of (or, sale of) federal funds for local funds to encourage the consolidation of federal funds on fewer projects
- 6) Use of Toll Credits to also promote the consolidation of federal funds
- 7) Require that match funds be available to others for use on projects to be non-federalized

FACTS

- Federally funded projects are typically process intensive, and therefore resource intensive. This makes delivery difficult for smaller agencies that don't have either the resources or the technical knowledge to navigate the federal process.
- There are some 450 municipalities and 58 counties in the state competing for federal funds. The Caltrans Division of Local Assistance burden to administer federalized projects for all those jurisdictions with varying degrees of resources and competence within those jurisdictions managing the projects is obviously overwhelming.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

- A. Caltrans accepts all of the available federal transportation funding, and exchanges that money with STIP, Bridge Toll, or whatever source of state funding, funneling state money back through the MPO's to distribute to the CMA's or local jurisdictions as the case may be. In this scenario, the same match could be applied to the state money to extend the funding, or not.
 - In this scenario, the "swap" occurs at the grant source. i.e. – when a call for projects is prepared for \$100 million worth of CMAQ funding for bike and ped improvements, for example, that money is purchased by Caltrans at that time, and the grant is then funded with state money.
 - Once the grant funding is replaced with state money, the money is allocated to the various MPO's using similar formulas, and projects compete as they would if it were federal funding.
- B. Second to Option A, would be very large jurisdictions combine to buy federal funding. For example LA County, Sacramento County, Santa Clara County and Caltrans would be established as exclusive agencies that are willing and capable of delivering federal projects efficiently, AND have available capital to purchase federal money. Similar to Option A, at the grant source (when a call for projects is being established), these jurisdictions buy the federal money at an exchange of 90 cents on the dollar, and the grant funding is replaced with various sources of local money.
 - As an incentive to these jurisdictions, in addition to the 10% gain, would be that Caltrans issues toll credits to these jurisdictions to pay any required match associated with the federal funding.
 - Once the grant funding is replaced with state money, the money is allocated to the various MPO's using similar formulas, and projects compete as they would if it were federal funding.
 - Obviously, these designated jurisdictions could also compete for the various grants just as they normally would.
- C. Purchasing federal funding at the CMA or local level. Where within a county one jurisdiction has a federalized project and is need of additional funding, that jurisdiction could take federal funding from another jurisdiction that is not able to use their federal funding allocation. Similar to Option B, this is done for 90 cents on the dollar

- May not be a preferred option primarily because it is done after the fact and there is too much uncertainty. Also, it is dependent upon a local agency having adequate local funding capital to buy the federal dollars.
 - One way to mitigate the local capital issue would be for Caltrans to issue toll credits to the agency taking the federal money to be used as match.
 - This Option is worth discussing only because it was actually done, and demonstrates that something similar to what this committee is pursuing is very possible if folks are willing to move out of the box.
- D. If we were to be successful pushing back the bureaucratic tide, and actually develop an approved way to “clean” federal money for the majority of California jurisdictions, we still would identify those jurisdictions in the state, with proven track records of delivering federally funded projects, to be eligible to compete to deliver federal grant projects.

PROS:

- Gives smaller jurisdictions a better opportunity to deliver much needed transportation projects with their limited resources.
- Relieves the burden on Caltrans Division of Local Assistance. This point cannot be overstated enough. Think about the workload for local assistance dealing with the same 5 to 10 well trained and well equipped jurisdictions on federal projects, versus 200.
- By placing the federal money in the hands of those agencies that are well equipped to deliver federalized projects, the delivery rate on federal projects improves. Process becomes more easily standardized, less cumbersome, and easier to control/administer. Makes locals, Caltrans, MPO's, CMA's and FHWA happy.

CONS:

- None are obvious other than the fact that Caltrans and FHWA need to look at funding from a “new” (Ahhhhhh!!!) perspective.

Next steps for 12.1

12. 1. 5. (Comment from 01-28-2016) We need to keep focused on this issue;
12. 1. 6. Ray will continue the conversation in HQ to market the ideas for the paper, “**WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS? (see upshot #)**”
12. 1. 7. (Comment from 03-03-2016) No report today.
12. 1. 8. (Comment from 07-21-2016) No report today.
12. 1. 9. (comment from 9/22/2016) I am proposing to use the OBAG2 grant as a case study for how federal dollars can be purchased by larger agencies with federal projects from smaller agencies, providing the smaller agencies with "clean" non-federalized funding. This is being set up currently at the CMA level with the Solano Transportation Authority. I will discuss this with Adriann and the rest of the committee. I would like to report to TCC on the outcome of this and how it worked.
12. 1. 10. (comment from 11/03/2016) We are waiting for the pilot to be developed. We will get back together to see if we have any other examples. John will be the lead, and the group will report back in January.
12. 1. 11. (comment from 1/26/2017) We will try to pilot this. We have a meeting on February 10th. We will be discussing what we should do next. L
12. 2. **Tiered Certification system Winton (Lead) - Adriann, Mike S, Ross, Sylvia F, Ian H. .**
12. 2. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Working on what the minimum qualifications would be. Not working on the tiered aspect now. Jean will be sending information out on certification programs in other states to the work group lead.
12. 2. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) We had a conference call a week ago. Team decided the goal is establish MQ's for all local agencies to be able to qualify to administer federally funded projects; develop a draft set of the MQ's and present to this group by the end of the year – last meeting for 2015; November meeting. We also want to present this to the League/CEAC meeting in March 2016. We are focusing on local public agencies, vs. NGO's. We are meeting monthly – next meeting will be June 2; then following the July TCC meeting. We will be researching various states for best practices.
12. 2. 3. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We have met a few times. We are combining parallel efforts. We looked at five different states' processes. Based on those, we are tabulating the information that will be applicable to California. We will be putting something on the table by November, for presentation to the TCC.
12. 2. 4. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We had a brief discussion and put together a matrix of new MQ's for agencies to enter into the federal aid process. This is intended to ensure they have the proper financial reporting system in place, and verify they have the ability to actually deliver the projects. Also this is intended to enable them to administer the process more efficiently. The next step would be to certify or tier more experienced agencies – They would be at a higher level of certification with more privileges associated with that level; agencies at lower levels of certifications would require more oversight. Agencies that do not meet the MQ's would have items identified for them which would need to be in place for them to administer federal funds. We would encourage them to partner with agencies that are more experienced.

12. 2. 5. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) We are looking at Fiscal, Staffing and Delivery as three domains. We have taken examples from other states. If you have any comments on the matrix send them to provide Winton comments.

12. 2. 6. (Comment from 01-28-2016) We have a matrix of minimum qualifications. Three areas: Staffing, fiscal and delivery. With new agencies entering into the system, we need to be able to help them through. For agencies struggling, we need to help them get back on track. By spending more time at the front end to help agencies move forward, we can spend less time on the back end. This needs to be marketed properly- "This is your path to success."

Next steps for 12.2

12. 2. 7. Review the material distributed by Winton. Can you make any suggestions to streamline or improve it?

12. 2. 8. We will continue to refine the definitions. How do we define deficiencies? How do we work with existing agencies who are already in the federal aid process? How do we implement this?

12. 2. 9. (Comment from 03-03-2016) We are awaiting comments from the group and will reconvene to see what the next steps are.

12. 2. 10. (Comment from 07-21-2016) Review Handout (Draft application & interview questions) and provide comments / input to Winton prior to 9/22 meeting

12. 2. 11. (comment from 9/22/2016) MQ Matrix was produced. We borrowed from other states – Arizona, Washington state. Initially there will be a provisional master agreement with the agency. We will have agencies do pilot projects, followed by compliance review. The result of this will ultimately allow agencies to receive certification allowing them to self-administer projects. (see handout, "Local Agency Certification to Administer Federal/State Transportation Projects.)

12. 2. 12. (comment from 9/22/2016) Next steps: Provide comments to Winton on the handout – We will get an update on Nov 3. (see upshot # 132)

12. 2. 13. (comment from 11/03/2016) We will be incorporating your comments between now and the January meeting.

12. 2. 14. (comment from 1/26/2017) We have received some comments – we have established a matrix, compared information from other states/ We are very close to culminating this effort – We have created a glossary, developed draft documents, sketched out steps for the application process to become self-certified. We will have a pilot process. Documents and procedures will eventually be posted on the LA website before March 9th meeting. New agencies will be required to go through the process.

~~12. 3. **Unobtrusive project performance data collection methods** Scott M (Lead) Mark, Mike P, Ross, Renee.~~

~~12. 3. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Hoping to get our group together in the next couple of weeks.~~

~~12. 3. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) developed out charter. We will be focusing on milestones we need to collect from all the potential milestones. Post construction Project Milestones were identified. Collect proposed and actual. We are looking for information that is already being gathered. The next step will be to get feedback which milestones among all the possible milestones we would collect. We want to see where projects are in the project development process, and help us identify slippage.~~

~~12. 3. 3. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Group comment is that project performance data should be able to help us to see if progress is being made. (Field and agency dates can be as much as a year apart on federal projects).~~

~~12. 3. 4. (Comment from 5/7/2015) It was mentioned as a question, would dates be kept from each progress report rather than overwriting previous dates, so we can see if progress is being made.~~

~~12. 3. 5. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Suggestions: Collect DBE data. Find data we already collect.~~

~~12. 3. 6. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We need to meet and agree on the items we want to take forward.~~

~~12. 3. 7. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We are looking at long term options for data collection – on line and real time data, and will be identifying pros and cons.~~

~~12. 3. 8. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) FHWA for the short term data collection will be data already provided by local agencies. This will only require that CT tabulates the data and sends it to FHWA. Long term: We will be looking at options. There will be a short memo out to the group on this.~~

~~12. 3. 9. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Comment from group: We would like to track the completion date. We need to collect this all once, in a way that ensures consistency.~~

~~12. 3. 10. (Comment from 03-03-2016)~~

Next steps for 12.3

~~12. 3. 1. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Send memo out to the group on data collection effort.~~

~~12. 3. 3. (Comment from 03-03-2016) Caltrans will work with FHWA on this.~~

- 12. 3. 4. ~~(Comment from 07-21-2016) Caltrans needs to find a way to collect the data (preferable electronically)~~
- 12. 3. 5. ~~(comment from 9/22/2016) No report today~~
- 12. 3. 6. ~~(comment from 11/03/2016) This is closed today.~~

12. 4. **A&E Procurement Oversight Mark (April, acting) – overall lead, Rick, Tom, Scott and Mike P**

- 12. 4. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Hoping to schedule the kickoff in the next couple of weeks.
- 12. 4. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) We had a kickoff meeting – We identified four items: On call consultants, pre-qualification, oversight and training. We are collecting issues we need to resolve. We will have further discussions for clarity. For on-call, we are going to look at State of Missouri and Oregon to see what their best practices are. We will be contacting Iowa for pre-qualification information. For oversight, we will try to find agencies that have done well – For Training – we will be looking a guidance in the procedures manual. For our team, the next step is contacting the other states. We will meet in the next couple of weeks. We hope to have the meetings set up with the other states by the end of May.
- 12. 4. 3. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Suggestion – may need to go with a regional approach.
- 12. 4. 4. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Avoid scope creep, stay focused.
- 12. 4. 5. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We have looked at Oregon and Iowa information. We will be following up with at least Oregon. We are moving on oversight and training aspects. We have 5 more A&E contract training sessions. There will be a need for legislative action to support this strategy and give Caltrans the authority to do this.
- 12. 4. 6. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We have looked at best practices. We will be meeting today to determine our next step. We are following two strategies – on-call contracts and pre-qualification of consultants. We have a meeting with CT Legal to discuss our approach with them.
- 12. 4. 7. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) We have legal advice on what we can actually do. We do not have a plan at this time, but we hope to have something to report on before the January meeting. On the training side, we delivered 5 trainings. There is one more training set for January.
- 12. 4. 8. (Comment from 01-28-2016) On call consultant contracts with taxk orders would require legislation
- 12. 4. 9. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Pre-qualified A&E contractor list would be easier to implement than the procurement model, with on-call contractors.
- 12. 4. 10. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Caltrans proposed a Budget Change Request to conduct a robust, pro-active oversight of local agency consultant procurement process. To do this they would establish a Consultant Contract Oversight Unit, similar to Construction Oversight Engineer role. They would Identify and advise on deficiencies before they become penalties/sanctions; LGA corrects and recovers. They would perform up to 150 contract procurement reviews annually. Reviews would be conducted for Pre-advertisement, Pre-selection and Pre-execution phases

Next steps for 12.4

- 12. 4. 11. Survey agencies to see if there is a lot of interest in pursuing the Oregon model. (On-call contracts) Find out who will support it and who would want to use the service if we move forward with it.
- 12. 4. 12. Survey the RTPA's and the MPO's to see who does pre-qualification list procurement.
- 12. 4. 13. Table the prequalification list option, for small contracts.
- 12. 4. 14. (Comment from 03-03-2016) We will develop the survey and get it out before the next meeting.
- 12. 4. 15. (Comment from 07-21-2016) Survery was sent out and completed...now compiling results
- 12. 4. 16. (comment from 9/22/2016) Porposal – option 1 Caltrans manages on call A&E consultant contracts. Option 2: Caltrans maintains a list of pre-qualified consultants for local agencies. This would require legislation. Roughly one out of four responses said they would receive benefits from on-call consultant process. Smaller agencies in rural areas would be most likely to benefit. “Pre-Qualified consultant list” has much more broad appeal, with a fifty-fifty split. The majority of agencies would prefer prequalified list over an on-call list. These statistics do not weigh agencies in terms of their size – The intention was to have one response per agency, but we are unsure this was actually the case. Detailed results are available on the website for Local Assistance. We will be meeting again to discuss the next steps. The survey was conducted in April and May of this year, and there were 370 responses.
- 12. 4. 17. (comment from 11/03/2016) Prequalified list would be useful to more agencies than an on-call contract process. We will discuss this in January tio see what the next steps are. This is a bigger issue than just A&E procurement.
- 12. 4. 18. (comment from 1/26/2017) Smaller agencies are struggling with the whole process of getting federal aid projects through the process. .

13	2:00	How to facilitate federal-aid project delivery by less experienced agencies	All	
----	------	---	-----	--

Agenda Item 13. Facilitating federal-aid projects

13. 1. **Challenges include**

- 13. 1. 1. Small agencies can be stuck if their RTPA does not want to get involved. Who can help them out when they are dead in the water?
- 13. 1. 2. How can the need be met when a local agency does not have the resources, experience or knowledge to get a project through the process?
- 13. 1. 3. Partner with a larger or more experienced agency if you can –
- 13. 1. 4. If you hire a consultant using federal funds, you still have to follow the consultant selection procedure and be able to administer a consultant contract.
- 13. 1. 5. Have a contract just for a consultant to get you through the process. One contract for construction could be federalized, and another for the consultant would not be federalized. You could hire a consultant outside the federal aid process and not pay them federal dollars and not seeking federal reimbursement for them. That part of their cost would not be a local match.
- 13. 1. 6. Can the Caltrans district help?
- 13. 1. 7. What about sample forms on line to help people see by example how to complete them? Sample allocation requests? There are sample RFP and RFQ forms on the LA website. (see upshot # 134)

14	3:00	Positioning for future state and federal funding opportunities and challenges		
----	------	---	--	--

Agenda Item 14. New transportation funding and positioning for future state and federal funding opportunities

- 14. 1. There are proposals for additional funding for transportation projects. How can local agencies take advantage of these funding opportunities?
- 14. 2. There may not be any money offered for the NGA request for data, but the new Cabinet Secretary for Transportation – we should think about the what types of needs can be met with public private partnerships – P3.
- 14. 3. Attend state hearings, work with your state legislators. New legislators may need to have our needs communicated to them.
- 14. 4. California legislation for transportation funding: For SB 1 hearing on Feb 14 at 1:30 – AB 1 has not been scheduled for a hearing yet.
- 14. 5. Should we push for maintenance work or new construction? We need to direct more funding to rehab and maintenance work.
- 14. 6. Fund the shortfall on the bridge program.
- 14. 7. We need a good mechanism to identify how we can retire some of the deferred maintenance, not just build new facilities.
- 14. 8. People need to know what they are going to get if we are to receive more revenue for transportation projects.
- 14. 9. We need to have shovel-ready projects. We need to have a little something ready, but not have a heavy shelf of plans, hoping for funding.
- 14. 10. Can we initiate projects now, get part of the way there without asking for federal funds?
- 14. 11. Process Streamlining – what can we do to make better use of the funds we do have.

15	3:45	Plan for 2017 Spring Conference		
----	------	---------------------------------	--	--

Agenda Item 15. Plan for the Spring Conference

- 15. 1. The conference will be in San Diego this year.
- 15. 2. Update at lunch on the work plan from 2016.

15. 3. We would like to have some input on the “doables” on our survey list. We need some feedback on how we might approach this. Some items could be combined.
15. 4. We would like to take this list at the next meeting and see how we can approach the doable items.

16	4:00	Meeting Wrap-up, evaluation, next steps	All	Close out
17		Adjourn	Ray Zhang	